| 1 2 | | | TESTIMONY OF F. PAUL RICHARDS |
|-----|----|----|--|
| 3 | 1. | Q. | Would you please state your full name, business address, and position |
| 4 | | | with respect to the petitioning company? |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | A. | My name is Frederick Paul Richards. My business address is 55 Bearfoot |
| 7 | | | Road, Northborough, MA. I am a Principal Environmental Engineer in |
| 8 | | | the Environmental Group of the National Grid USA Service Company |
| 9 | | | which performs environmental and other services for the companies in the |
| 10 | | | National Grid System, of which the petitioner is one. Our Group is |
| 11 | | | responsible for the environmental studies and analyses which support the |
| 12 | | | engineering design, permitting and licensing of the subject project. |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | 2. | Q. | What are your professional qualifications? |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | A. | I have a Masters Degree in Marine Biology and have been an |
| 17 | | | environmental consultant/environmental engineer for over 30 years. I |
| 18 | | | have published or presented numerous papers at scientific meetings and |
| 19 | | | environmental conferences. Currently I am a member of the Society of |
| 20 | | | Wetland Scientists and the Association of Massachusetts Wetland |
| 21 | | | Scientists. I serve as a member of the Princeton Conservation |
| 22 | | | Commission. |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | 3. | Q. | Have you previously testified and given a statement of your qualifications |
| 25 | | | in proceedings before the Department? |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | A. | Yes, I have done so in the following proceedings Risingdale, 23kV |
| 28 | | | lines, DPU 95-57; the Quincy Cable Project, DPU 97-98/97-99 and EFSB |
| 29 | | | 97-3; Golden Rock 115kV line extension, DTE 99-70 and the Westford |
| 30 | | | #57 Substation, DTE 01-77. |
| 31 | | | |

| 1 | 4. | Q. | What was your responsibility for this project? |
|----|--------|--------|--|
| 2 | | ٨ | I have been regnerable for working with the engineers and consultants in |
| 3 | | A. | I have been responsible for working with the engineers and consultants in developing an environmental assessment for the proposed new Bay #5 and |
| 5 | | | capacitor banks as well as ancillary structures at our Salem Harbor |
| 6 | | | Switchyard (Switchyard). |
| 7 | | | Switchyard (Switchyard). |
| 8 | 5. | Q. | How did you evaluate the potential environmental impact of the proposed |
| 9 | υ. | ζ. | project? |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | A. | I evaluated the proposed project in light of the land use/environmental |
| 12 | | | elements of the Department's Checklist for Filing of Zoning Exemptions. |
| 13 | | | Specifically I considered land use, wetlands, water resources, visual |
| 14 | | | resources, noise, traffic and access, public safety, air pollutant emissions, |
| 15 | | | and hazardous substances. |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | 6. | Q. | Were the data and responses prepared by you or by others working under |
| 18 | | | your supervision or direction? |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | A. | Yes. |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | 7. | Q. | Please provide your testimony relative to the items associated with the |
| 23 | | | Department's Checklist. |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | A. | I will answer in the order presented in the Checklist. I will first describe |
| 26 | | | the existing conditions for each item followed by my assessment of |
| 27 | | | impact. |
| 28 | | | |
| 29 | Existi | ng Con | nditions |
| 30 | | | |

1 Land Use---The Salem Harbor Switchyard's proposed Bay #5/Trench/Capacitor Bank 2 site (the Site) is located on a peninsula between Salem Harbor and Collins Cove. The 3 proximate land use surrounding the existing Switchyard consists of the generating station 4 itself, a tank farm, the wastewater treatment works and a residential neighborhood 5 (northwesterly about 250 ft). The Site footprint will be on land currently serving as a 6 small portion of a much larger existing parking lot for the power plant. 7 8 Wetlands---There are no wetlands or wetland resource areas located at or near the Site as 9 defined under the MA Wetlands Protection Act or the City's wetland bylaw. The nearest 10 coastal feature and associated flood plain is the harbor several hundred feet away. 11 12 Water Resources---Salem and Beverly harbors are the largest water bodies near the Site. 13 There are no other surface water bodies in the vicinity of the Switchyard. 14 15 Visual Resources---The viewshed is dominated by the power plant, tank farm and 16 wastewater treatment plant. The views in the direction of the Site will be greatly 17 influenced by these existing features. Presently, there is a wooden stockade fence, a row 18 of arbor vitae and other ornamental shrubs, and tall deciduous trees (about 30 ft tall) 19 between the abutting neighborhood (5 residences face the generating station) and the 20 parking lot. 21 22 Noise Environment---The Site currently has ambient background noise associated with 23 the commercial, industrial and residential activities in the area. Vehicular noise and 24 power station noise are the dominant components. 25 26 Traffic and Access---The main roads to the site are Derby and Fort streets. There are 27 several other commercial/residential streets on the Salem Neck peninsula. The other 28 major roads in the area are Bridge Street, Rt. 114 (Lafayette Street), and Essex Street. 29 Salem is noted for its tight streets and heavy traffic volume. Fort Street, the main 30 thoroughfare, leads to Salem Willows Park.

| I | |
|----|---|
| 2 | Public Safety ConsiderationsPublic safety is assured because power plant site is |
| 3 | vehicular and pedestrian access-controlled by a manned guard house. The equipment |
| 4 | proposed for the Site is behind an interior fence. |
| 5 | |
| 6 | Air Pollutant EmissionsThe Salem Harbor power station has air emission |
| 7 | considerations which are beyond the scope of this existing environmental setting |
| 8 | discussion for the proposed Site. |
| 9 | |
| 10 | Use of Hazardous SubstancesSulfur hexafluoride (SF 6) is defined as hazardous by the |
| 11 | U. S. Dept. of Transportation. It is a gas used to insulate circuit breakers in a substation. |
| 12 | Its hazard risk stems from being an asphyxiate by displacing oxygen in the lungs when |
| 13 | breathed. It is a colorless, odorless, nontoxic, and nonflammable gas and is shipped as a |
| 14 | liquefied gas. |
| 15 | |
| 16 | Impact Assessment |
| 17 | |
| 18 | Land UseThe current land use will be maintained. Proposed equipment for the Site is |
| 19 | consistent with the existing, surrounding Switchyard equipment. Therefore there is no |
| 20 | proposed change in land use. |
| 21 | |
| 22 | WetlandsThere are no wetlands or wetland resource areas in the vicinity of the Site and |
| 23 | therefore there will be no impact. |
| 24 | |
| 25 | Water ResourcesThere will be some limited runoff from the Site when asphalt is |
| 26 | removed and soils are exposed during construction. The construction foot print will be |
| 27 | approximately 7,000 sq ft. Discharge will be controlled by using erosion control wood |
| 28 | chip bales, if necessary, to impede runoff. If dewatering is required at any of the |
| 29 | foundation locations, the resultant discharge will be to a lined haybale corral or to a |
| | |

wetlands filter bag in order to prevent sediment migration offsite.

30

Page 5 of 8

1 2 Visual Resources---There will be virtually no impact to visual resources as the proposed 3 Bay #5 and capacitor banks are in keeping with the general equipment profile and height 4 already in place at the existing Switchyard. That coupled with the existing screening 5 negates any significant change in the existing viewshed. 6 7 Noise---Additional noise generated at the Site will be short term and associated with the 8 construction phase of the project. For example, the asphalt will be cut and removed. 9 Backhoes and similar equipment will excavate for foundations. Truck traffic will bring 10 cement, structural and electrical equipment to the site. All these temporary noises will 11 occur during the daytime construction window as dictated by DEP and Salem noise 12 regulations. The same vegetative and structural features separating the neighborhood 13 from the power plant currently will also serve to attenuate the temporary noise impact. 14 The heavy equipment part of construction is approximated to last about 6 months. 15 16 Traffic and Access---The proposed project will not generate significant vehicular traffic nor change access to the Site. At any given time there are anticipated to be about 8 17 18 persons onsite associated with construction. Since the Switchyard is unmanned, there 19 will be no added Operations and Maintenance (O & M) personnel traveling to the Site 20 once construction is completed. 21 22 Public Safety Considerations---As noted previously the power plant site is secured. The 23 proposed project will be enclosed within its own fencing. 24 25 Air Pollution Emissions---The equipment being installed is not a source of air pollutants. 26 There are no air quality regulations or controls for capacitors and breakers. 27 28 Use of Hazardous Substances---Although SF 6 is defined as hazardous by DOT, there is

no risk of general public exposure. The Switchyard is not enclosed but open to the air.

Thus there is no opportunity for SF 6 to concentrate and become a threat in displacing

29

30

| 1 | oxygen either to workers or to the general public. The breakers are located in a chain- | | | | |
|----|--|---------|--|--|--|
| 2 | linked fenced yard. They are installed and maintained by trained technical staff. They are | | | | |
| 3 | checked for integrity during inspections by company personnel. | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | 8. | Q. | Does the proposed project exceed triggers for MEPA review? | | |
| 6 | | | | | |
| 7 | | A. | No. The MEPA regulations at 301 CMR Section 11.03 define review | | |
| 8 | | | thresholds pertaining to MEPA review at either the Environmental | | |
| 9 | | | Notification Form or Environmental Impact Report levels. Concurrent | | |
| 10 | | | with exceeding a MEPA threshold, an applicant's project must also | | |
| 11 | | | require a state permit or approval related directly to the threshold activity. | | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 13 | The zo | oning e | xemption sought in this proceeding is not tied to any MEPA threshold | | |
| 14 | described below. Furthermore, in the case of the proposed new Bay 5 and capacitor | | | | |
| 15 | banks associated with the Salem Harbor Switchyard, the project is below the following | | | | |
| 16 | MEPA | thresh | iolds: | | |
| 17 | | | | | |
| 18 | 1) | Land- | There are no changes affecting the seven MEPA triggers. | | |
| 19 | 2) | Rare S | SpeciesThe area is a Switchyard and parking lot. | | |
| 20 | 3) | Wetla | ands, Waterways and TidelandsNo applicable resources are affected in the | | |
| 21 | | Switch | hyard or parking lot. | | |
| 22 | 4) | Water | rThe project has no water requirements, nor does it affect nearby estuarine | | |
| 23 | | waters | s. | | |
| 24 | 5) | Waste | ewaterThere is no wastewater associated with the project. | | |
| 25 | 6) | Trans | portationThere are no transportation issues associated with the project. | | |
| 26 | 7) | Energ | syThere are no new transmission lines associated with the project. | | |
| 27 | 8) | Air | There are no air emissions associated with the project. | | |
| 28 | 9) | Solid | and Hazardous WasteThere are no solid or hazardous wastes associated | | |
| 29 | | with t | he project. | | |
| | | | | | |

| 1 | | 10) Historical and Archaeological ResourcesThe Site is highly disturbed currently, | | | | | |
|----|-----|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | | | as it is being used as a Switchyard and parking lot. | | | | |
| 3 | | 11) | 1) Areas of Critical Environmental ConcernThe Site is not in an ACEC. | | | | |
| 4 | | 12) | 2) RegulationsNot applicable. | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | |
| 6 | 9. | | Q. | What environmental permits are needed by the Project? | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | A. | None. Based on my analysis of the Site location, construction and | | | |
| 9 | | | | operation along with consideration for factors associated with permitting, I | | | |
| 10 | | | | reached the following conclusions: | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | 1. | Wetlar | nds Protection ActNot applicable, no wetlands or buffer zone affected. | | | |
| 13 | , | 2. | Salem | Wetlands Protection BylawNot applicable, same as above. | | | |
| 14 | , | 3. | Chapte | er 91Not applicable, not on filled tidelands. | | | |
| 15 | 4 | 4. | MEPA | Not applicable, no review threshold exceeded. | | | |
| 16 | ; | 5. | US EP | A NPDES Storm WaterNot applicable, less than 1 acre disturbance. | | | |
| 17 | (| 6. | Corps | Section 404Not applicable, no wetland fill. | | | |
| 18 | , | 7. | MA D | EP Section 401Not applicable, no wetland fill. | | | |
| 19 | ; | 8. | Article | e 97Not applicable, no public open space affected. | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | B. | Other Environmental Considerations | | | |
| 22 | | | | | | | |
| 23 | | 1. | Spill P | revention, Control and Countermeasure Plan The existing Spill | | | |
| 24 | | | Preven | ntion, Control and Countermeasure Plan for the Switchyard will be revised. | | | |
| 25 | , | 2. | MA Co | ontingency PlanNot applicable, although National Grid has to test any | | | |
| 26 | | | excess | soils prior to shipment offsite. | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | | |
| 29 | 10. | | Q. | Does this conclude your testimony? | | | |
| 30 | | | | | | | |

1 A. Yes, it does.